

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed April 1, 2009, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application, where claim 13 has been currently added. Claims 1 and 11 are independent.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice. Further, the specification has been amended to correct certain informalities.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1-11 have been amended for non-statutory reasons, such as for better form including beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A', and changing "characterized in that" to --wherein--. Such amendments to claims 1-11 were not made in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the Office Action, claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0174270 (Stecyk) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,791,467 (Ben-Ze'ev). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-13 are patentable Ben- Stecyk and Ze'ev for at least the following reasons.

Stecyk is directed to an apparatus, methods, and systems for centrally and uniformly controlling the operation of a variety of devices. Ze'ev is directed to a method and system for the remote controlling of appliances includes an adaptive remote controller that adapts itself automatically to its environment so as to remotely control a plurality of appliances.

It respectfully submitted that Stecyk, Ze'ev, and combination thereof, do not disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 9-11 which, amongst other patentable elements, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):


wherein in response to a user entering the desired device name in the mobile input unit and bringing the mobile input unit within the range, the desired device name is automatically transmitted from the mobile input unit to the device and the name memory of the device is overwritten with the desired device name.

These features are nowhere disclosed or suggested in Stecyk and Ze'ev, alone or in combination. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 9-11 which are allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-8 and 12-13 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 11, as well as their individually patentable elements. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
June 30, 2009

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101